

9665 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 201  
San Diego, California 92123

Prepared for: City of Carlsbad, California  
Project Title: Drainage Master Plan Update  
Project No: 128290-001  
Subject: Updated Planned Local Drainage Area Fees  
Date: November 12, 2007  
To: David Hauser, P.E., Deputy City Engineer  
From: Grant Hoag, P.E.  
Chris Herencia, P.E.  
Copy to: Steven Jantz, Associate Engineer



Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Grant Hoag, P.E.

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Christian Herencia, P.E.  
Supervising Engineer

**Limitations:**

*This document was prepared solely for City of Carlsbad in accordance with professional standards at the time the services were performed and in accordance with the contract between City of Carlsbad and Brown and Caldwell dated April 12, 2005. This document is governed by the specific scope of work authorized by City of Carlsbad; it is not intended to be relied upon by any other party except for regulatory authorities contemplated by the scope of work. We have relied on information or instructions provided by City of Carlsbad and other parties and, unless otherwise expressly indicated, have made no independent investigation as to the validity, completeness, or accuracy of such information.*

The purpose of this memo is to summarize the assumptions, findings and recommendations for updated Planned Local Drainage Area (PLDA) fees. The PLDA fees have been updated at part of the City of Carlsbad Drainage Master Plan (DMP) update.

This memo summarizes the current PLDA fees, the funding of capital improvement plan costs identified in the Master Plan, the local and state regulations affecting the PLDA calculations, fee calculation methodology, the pros and cons of alternative PLDA structures, and recommendations. Please refer to the attached tables and three appendices (that will also be incorporated into Chapter 5 of the DMP) while reviewing this technical memorandum.

## 1. CURRENT PLDA FEES

The City's *impact fees* for funding the drainage facilities are called PLDA fees. These fees must be proportional to the runoff flow-based burden placed on drainage systems by development, and are a function of the land use type and the area of a development parcel. PLDA impact fees are assessed to developers when a subdivision map is issued to mitigate the financial impacts of new development on the local community.

The City is divided into four existing PLDAs, by watershed area. The fees were last reviewed in 1992, but are increased periodically based on inflationary changes in construction costs. Currently either a high or a low runoff fee is applied to the variety of land use types within each PLDA. The current fees are shown below:

PLDA Fees (\$/acre, effective September 1, 2006)

Runoff Level	Planned Local Drainage Area			
	A	B	C	D
Low	\$2,208	\$4,748	\$3,549	\$49
High	\$3,614	\$7,767	\$5,809	\$79

The last master plan, completed in March 1994, provided the basis for the current PLDA areas and fees. As shown, the fees vary broadly among the PLDAs. The differences were due to the different costs of development-related drainage projects in each area.

Each PLDA is independently funded, and has a restricted cash reserve fund for the exclusive use of development-related drainage facility expansion payments. Currently these PLDA funds hold cash balances that are for the project costs identified in the DMP, as shown in the attached Table 5-1. The \$6.6 million in undesignated funds are as shown below:

Undesignated Balances (as of December 2006)

Planned Local Drainage Area			
A	B	C	D
\$164,866	\$2,794,399	\$3,436,213	\$214,271

In addition, \$1,074,220 in PLDA B fees is due from developers who have made partial payments on recent industrial developments, totaling 242 acres. The resulting balances total \$7.6 million.

Limits imposed by the City on “constrained” lands result in certain areas being restricted to open space. These constrained lands do not increase drainage requirements or require new facilities, and are not billed PLDA fees. Moreover, under City code, publicly owned parcels (including city, county, and school lands) cannot be charged PLDA fees. As such, all drainage facility costs on public lands must be funded from sources other than PLDA fee proceeds.

## 2. MASTER PLAN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COSTS

The Master Plan has identified drainage projects required for land development in each PLDA. The estimated construction costs for the new storm drainage projects is \$20 million, reflecting the new and expanded facilities that will be required to serve the proposed developments. These costs include the construction estimated design, construction management, and contingency costs. The projects are summarized in Table 5-2.

As shown below, with the \$7.6 million in existing PLDA fee balances available to fund the project costs, only \$12.8 million in additional project funding is required.

Required Funding for Drainage Projects

	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	Net
New Development Projects	\$1,643,289	\$12,593,270	\$4,251,961	\$1,983,958	\$20,472,477
Less Differential Due on Net Fees with Deposits		(\$1,074,220)			(\$1,074,220)
Less PLDA Fund Balance	(\$164,866)	(\$2,794,399)	(\$3,436,213)	(\$214,271)	(\$6,609,749)
Unfunded Costs within each PLDA	\$1,478,423	\$8,724,650	\$815,748	\$1,769,687	\$12,788,508

This cost represents almost \$4,800 per acre in project costs, in contrast to the less than \$2,000 per acre in project costs funded from the current PLDA fees. City regulations prohibit charging of PLDA fees for capital projects serving stormwater drainage from publicly-owned lands. As such, the total collectable PLDA fees are further reduced by \$197,000. Table 5-5 provides a summary of the PLDA balances, costs and payments.

## 3. LOCAL AND STATE REGULATIONS

Based on City and State government codes, and on standards for developer extractions to fund municipal facilities, an *impact fee* must be based on an “essential nexus” to the impact from development on the community. This nexus is to be based on “rough proportionality” between the fee level and the City’s cost to mitigate the impacts of new development.

The legislation providing authority for, and specifying the methodology of, improvement exactions including impact fees, are found in the statutory provisions of the Government Code of the State of California Subdivision Map Act sections paragraphs 66410 – 66499. These sections impose numerous restrictions on the establishment and use of impact fees. For example, money collected through such impact fees must be kept in separate PLDA funds (accounts), and expended solely for the construction or reimbursement of new drainage facilities within that PLDA. Under Government Code Sections 66020 – 66025 et al (aka AB 1600), the fee proceeds must be expended or committed within five years of their payment. This provision may be applicable to the current cash reserves in PLDA C, which cannot be used for the projects in the other three City PLDAs.

The nature, use, and limitations of PLDA fees are also defined in City Municipal Code (CMC) 15.08 (Ordinance NS-293 paragraph 2). These Code sections prohibit billing PLDA (impact) fees to publicly-owned parcels. These parcels include city, county, and school district lands. This provision results in the aforementioned shortfall in projection of PLDA fee proceeds, and must be funded from other sources.

## 4. FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Calculation of the acreage-based fees is based on the costs of expansion-related projects required for increases in stormwater drainage, divided by the new drainage flows from the developments. These unit costs are then cross-referenced to the different land use types based on the levels of the drainage flows (runoff coefficients). Finally, these different land uses (runoff coefficients) are grouped into three runoff levels described as low, medium and high flows. Of special note is that the medium density (RM) land use type was classified in the low runoff category in 1992, but is herein reclassified as a medium runoff level based on updated runoff coefficients. Moreover, the proposed fee structure changes the RMH medium/high-density and RH high-density housing categories from high to medium.

Based on this approach there is a defensible nexus between the PLDA fees and the additional drainage (stormwater runoff) facilities required for new development of open space lands. These calculations are provided in Tables 5-3 and 5-4, with the results of the allocated costs by land use type in Table 5-6.

## 5. ALTERNATIVE PLDA FEE STRUCTURES

Three different PLDA fee structures were identified in this analysis. These include (1) the current structure with two (low and high) runoff level categories, (2) three runoff level categories of low, medium and high, and (3) the consolidation of all four PLDAs into one citywide area with either two or three runoff categories.

Also developed was a cashflow analysis identifying the receipt of PLDA fee proceeds and the project expenditures. This sources and uses of fund analysis did not identify material cashflow deficiencies, and was eliminated from the final analysis.

In each alternative the same PLDA proceeds are collected and the same assumptions used; the only difference among the three alternatives was the fee structure. As previously described, the new project costs of the DMP are more than double per acre more than the costs of the 1992 master plan. The two key assumptions used in all three alternatives were that unplanned infill development (representing redevelopment in existing residential and business areas) equals 10 percent of the currently developed areas, and that constrained development was estimated at 15 percent of the planned development areas. Constrained development represents the portion of developable parcels which are left as open space under local subdivision and building codes. These constrained areas remain undeveloped, do not increase drainage requirements or require new facilities, and are not be billed a PLDA fee.

The updated PLDA fees using the existing rate structure are shown in Table 5-7 and Table 5-8. The characteristics, pros and cons of each fee alternative are as follows:

### Alternative 1

**Current PLDA Structure with Low & High Categories.** Applying the DMP CIP to the current fee structure, with four PLDAs and two runoff categories, results in the fees per acre shown below.

The key benefits of using the current structure are the convenience of using a known and accepted fee structure. This important factor simplifies updating the charges by reducing the resistance to the unknown qualities of a new methodology. The key disadvantage is that with the updated fees much higher than the

## Updated PLDA Fees (\$/Acre by runoff area)

Runoff Level	Acres	Planned Local Drainage Area			
		A	B	C	D
Low	1,720	\$4,751	\$2,622	\$1,587	\$1,539
High	912	\$16,079	\$10,812	\$5,938	\$4,740

past fees, the land developers straddling the shift point from low to high (but classified as high) may argue that they more equitably fall into a lower category at the reduced rate. This argument is less effective with more billing categories.

## Alternative 2

**Updated PLDA Structure with Low, Medium & High Categories.** To address the key disadvantage of the current fee structure, an updated fee structure with three runoff categories was developed. The results in fee per acre are shown below.

## Updated PLDA Fees (\$/Acre)

Runoff Level	Acres	Planned Local Drainage Area				
		A	B	C	D	Average
Low	1,487	\$4,570	\$2,582	\$1,391	\$1,427	\$2,472
Medium	383	\$9,088	\$4,978	\$1,968	\$2,334	\$4,274
High	762	\$19,804	\$11,191	\$6,029	\$6,184	\$10,125

The key benefits of this rate structure are an increase in fee equity with greater accuracy in the rates, and a reduction in proposed fees (over continued use of the current fee structure) for 1,288 acres of proposed development. The main disadvantage is that the PLDA fees will be increasing fees (over continued use of the current fee structure) for the remaining development, including 234 acres of medium density RM land use.

A standard unit of evaluation is the proposed PLDA fee per dwelling unit. For medium density (RM) housing with 6 dwelling units per acre, the proposed fees are from \$328 per dwelling in PLDA C to \$1,515 per dwelling in PLDA A. For the highest density housing (RH) with 19 dwelling units per acre on mostly impervious land, the fee is from \$317 per dwelling unit in PLDA C to \$1,042 per dwelling in PLDA A.

## Alternative 3

**Consolidation of all PLDAs into a Single Citywide Fee.** The third alternative considered the elimination of all PLDAs by consolidation of the citywide drainage project costs into a single set of fees based on the three categories. The results of this consolidation are shown below in fees per acre.

## Updated PLDA Fees (\$/Acre by runoff area)

Runoff Level	Single Citywide Fee Area	
	Acres	Fee
Low	1,487	\$2,472
Medium	383	\$4,274
High	762	\$10,125

The key benefit of this rate structure is the elimination of the different fees of each PLDA, and the potential use Citywide of current funds currently limited to one area, subject to an evaluation of City Legal Counsel. This consolidation has precedence in the City, as the current four PLDAs once consisted of many more drainage areas. The main disadvantage is that the PLDA fees in the PLDA C and D will increase.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The use of development extractions is recommended as the primary source of funding for new storm drainage facilities. Development extractions will include payment of PLDA impact fees on an acreage basis, contributions of developer-built facilities, and lump sum payments under developer agreements. The existing low and high runoff categories for the PLDA fees should be expanded into low, medium and high categories represented in Alternative 2, to more accurately allocate the costs of the expansion-related drainage projects to the scheduled development areas. Finally, the medium density residential land use type RM, along with several high density residential classes, should be reclassified into the proposed new medium runoff category. This proposed method is consistent with past practice and the City's Growth Management Program.

A developer who constructs all or a portion of one or more of the drainage facilities identified in the Drainage Master Plan study may be eligible for reimbursement from funds accumulated through collection of PLDA fees, insofar as the facility costs were included within the fee computation formula. An administrative variance procedure should be established to allow waivers of payment of PLDA fees. These waivers would be primarily for projects having slopes greater than 25 percent and less than 40 percent, as defined in Chapter 21.95 CMC; for these projects, one-half the fee for those portions may be waived.

## TABLES

---

### Table 5-1

Present Financial Status

### Table 5-2

New Development Project Costs by PLDA

### Table 5-3

Land Development Characteristics by PLDA

### Table 5-4

Land Use and Future Development by PLDA

### Table 5-5

Total PLDA-Related Balances, Costs & Payments

### Table 5-6

Project Costs Allocated to Land Uses by PLDA

### Table 5-7

PLDA Fee Calculations

### Table 5-8

PLDA Fee Comparison Summary

Table 5-1. Present Financial Status

Description	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	Total
Undesignated PLDA Proceeds Balance (a)	\$164,866	\$2,794,399	\$3,436,213	\$214,271	\$6,609,749
<b>PLDA Fee Differentials -- Balance Due (b)</b>					
	Acres				Deposit (\$/acre)
	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	
Planned Industrial (PI)		209			\$6,463
Planned Industrial (PI)		33			\$5,855

Source: Project staff 12/8/06

- a. The undesignated PLDA balances are the current cash balance from PLDA fees as of 1/1/06 that have not been designated, and are available for current and projected projects.
- b. Partial payments were made on certain developments, with the balance of the PLDA Fee due upon finalization of the updated PLDA fee.



Table 5-2. New Development Project Costs by PLDA

Pipe ID	Length (ft)	Diameter (in)	Material	Construction Cost (a)	Mark-up Costs (b)	Capital Project Cost
<b>PLDA A</b>						
AAAA	900	24	RCP Type	\$176,731	\$161,048	\$337,780
AAA	550	36	RCP Type	\$119,138	\$110,763	\$229,901
AC	1000 & 275	36 & 18	RCP Type & Concrete Type	\$468,663	\$370,598	\$839,261
AFA	2000	Channel	Natural Enhanced Channel	\$27,747	\$65,377	\$93,124
AFB	3600	Channel	Natural Enhanced Channel	\$55,520	\$87,702	\$143,222
<b>Total PLDA A</b>						<b>\$1,643,289</b>
<b>PLDA B</b>						
B	3000	Channel	Channel Dredging	\$902,270	\$738,144	\$1,640,414
BB-1	1100	18	RCP Type	\$138,075	\$123,692	\$261,767
BB-2	1700	36	Earthen Channel	\$320,726	\$258,394	\$579,120
BCA	2900	24	RCP Type	\$476,536	\$383,506	\$860,042
BCB	925	30	RCP Type	\$215,732	\$176,652	\$392,385
BCC	925	36	RCP Type	\$216,583	\$179,032	\$395,615
BFA	1600	42	RCP Type	\$418,521	\$342,113	\$760,634
BFB-U	3800	Channel	Roadside Swale	\$63,146	\$65,025	\$128,171
BFB-L	800	48	RCP Type	\$192,293	\$178,021	\$370,313
BF1	N/A	Sed Basin	Detention Basin	\$206,044	\$174,894	\$380,938
BJ-1	270 & N/A	RCB & Sed Basin	Detention Basin(3'x6' Box Culvert)	\$250,896	\$204,834	\$455,730
BJB	N/A	Outlet Structure	Wing Wall For 7'x11' Box Culvert	\$73,491	\$71,258	\$144,750
BL-U	800	39	RCP Type	\$161,971	\$151,804	\$313,775
BL-L	20 & 125	90 & Bridge	RCP Type and Bridge	\$507,638	\$1,072,506	\$1,580,144
BM	260	RCB	Drainage Culvert	\$98,789	\$61,039	\$159,828
BNB	3600	84	RCP Type	\$1,759,549	\$1,447,274	\$3,206,823
BN	3600	Channel	Channel Dredging and Gabion Structures	\$171,807	\$189,166	\$360,973
BQ	800	Spot Enhance	Natural Enhanced Channel	\$61,393	\$59,045	\$120,438
BR	150	66		\$94,281	\$86,492	\$180,773
BP	28 & 71	Sed Basin & RCB	Detention Basin	\$176,356	\$124,281	\$300,637
<b>Total PLDA B</b>						<b>\$12,593,270</b>
<b>PLDA C</b>						
C1	100	BRIDGE	Box Culvert Bridge	\$1,424,013	\$1,670,184	\$3,094,197
C2	90	RCB	Drainage Culvert	\$203,490	\$432,693	\$636,183
CA	600	Concrete Channel	Concrete Channel	\$186,308	\$335,273	\$521,581
<b>Total PLDA C</b>						<b>\$4,251,961</b>
<b>PLDA D</b>						
DBA	360	30	RCP Type	\$68,456	\$70,056	\$138,512
DBB	720	30	RCP Type	\$188,803	\$165,804	\$354,608
DFA	N/A	Treatment System	Detention Basin	\$93,227	\$132,238	\$225,465
DQB	2500	36	RCP Type	\$293,896	\$251,928	\$545,824
DH	3111	Spot Enhance	Natural Enhanced Channel	\$111,754	\$115,310	\$227,065
DZ	100	RCB (2)	Cast in place Bridge	\$316,488	\$175,998	\$492,485
<b>Total PLDA D</b>						<b>\$1,983,958</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>\$20,472,477</b>

All project costs are for new facilities to serve the proposed developments.

a. Source: File Basin Total Master.XLS 11/29/06

b. Estimated design, CM and contingency markups.

Table 5-3. Land Development Characteristics by PLDA

Land Use Code	Land Use Description	1. Parcel Characteristics				2. Ultimate City Build-out (including constrained areas open space, acres)					3. Net Developable Acreage (net of constrained areas, acres, a)				
		Runoff Coeff (Incr. b)	Billable Parcels (c)	Infill Growth	Constrained Lands (% d)	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	City Total	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	City Total
C	Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%		0.9		7.6	8		0.2		1.1	1
C/O/RMH	Community Commercial/Professional & Related/Medium-High Density	65%	Yes	Yes	15%				159.0	159					0
CF	Community Facilities (e)	30%	No	No	0%	0.8	3.3	0.8	18.9	24				7.9	8
CF/P	Community Facilities/Private Schools (e)	30%	No	No	0%				15.9	16					0
E	Elementary School	30%	No	No	0%	23.5	41.5	0.9	120.8	187					0
E/J	Elementary School/Junior High (e)	30%	No	No	0%	8.3	12.2			21					0
G	Governmental Facilities	65%	No	No	0%	8.4	173.1	139.3		321					0
G/O	Government Facilities/Office & Related Commercial (e)	65%	No	No	0%				2.2	2					0
H	High School	30%	No	No	0%	1.4	78.8		88.5	169		33.8			34
HC	Continuation School	30%	No	No	0%		3.9			4					0
J	Junior High School	30%	No	No	0%		21.9		28.9	51					0
L	Local Shopping Mall (e)	65%	Yes	Yes	15%	35.1	30.8		95.7	162		17.6		39.9	57
N	Neighborhood Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%			11.2	15.0	26					0
O	Office & Related Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%	6.5	2.9		9.4	19	0.5	2.0		6.9	9
O/PI	Office & Related Commercial/Planned Industrial (e)	65%	Yes	Yes	15%		31.9	62.9		95					0
OS	Open Space	0%	No	No	100%	521	2,754	321	3,492	7,088	0.5	5.6			6
P	Private School	30%	Yes	No	15%	1.3	1.3			3					0
PI	Planned Industrial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%		1,488.4	887.4	114.8	2,491		328.9	12.6	0.2	342
PI/O	Planned Industrial/Office & Related	65%	Yes	Yes	15%			36.1	2.8	39					0
R	Regional Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%	96.5	119.6	24.2		240	1.9	40.5			42
R/O/RMH	Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Medium-High Density (e)	65%	Yes	Yes	15%				19.9	20					0
RH	High Density Residential	45%	Yes	Yes	15%	13.0	161.0	5.9	119.8	300	0.2	2.7		2.6	5
RH/C/O	High Density Residential/Community Commercial/Office and Related Comm	50%	Yes	Yes	15%		10.8			11		4.0			4
RH/L/CF	Hi Dens Res/Affordable Housing/Local Shop Ctr/Comm Facil (e)	50%	Yes	Yes	15%				28.3	28					0
RH/O	High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	50%	Yes	Yes	15%				1.0	1					0
RL	Low Density Residential	15%	Yes	Yes	15%	4.5	275.1	11.2	427.0	718	1.1	135.0		21.7	158
RLM	Low-Medium Density Residential	15%	Yes	Yes	15%	876.6	2,971.2	291.9	3,824.9	7,965	66.4	522.1	19.3	132.1	740
RM	Medium Density Residential	20%	Yes	Yes	15%	221.8	460.2	376.0	1,383.2	2,441	0.3	5.6	1.0	41.3	48
RM/O	Medium Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	25%	Yes	Yes	15%	10.1		2.7	2.1	15					0
RMH	Medium-High Density Residential	30%	Yes	Yes	15%	117.7	220.8	36.6	594.0	969	2.1	7.9		16.0	26
RMH/O	Medium-High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	30%	Yes	Yes	15%	9.6	10.0			20	0.4	0.7			1
RMH/T-R	Medium-High Density Residential/Travel/Recreation														
TC	Commercial	30%	Yes	Yes	15%				11.7	12				4.9	5
T-C	Transportation Corridor	65%	No	No	0%	67.2	150.9	84.0	152.0	454					0
T-R	Travel/Recreation Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%	2.4	121.4	220.9	107.6	452	0.6	37.3	1.7	1.3	41
T-R/C	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Community Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%		1.2	13.0	17.4	31					0
T-R/L	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Local Shopping Center (e)	65%	Yes	Yes	15%			0.0	28.0	28					0
T-R/O	Travel/Recreation Commercial/ Office & Related Commercial	65%	Yes	Yes	15%	0.0	7.5	10.9		18			4.3		4
T-R/O/OS	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Open Space	50%	Yes	Yes	15%	99.6				100					0
T-R/RH	Travel/Recreation Commercial/High Density (e)	65%	Yes	Yes	15%			1.5	5.3	7					0
U	Public Utilities	45%	No	No	0%	0.8	130.0	28.4	9.7	169					0
UA	Unplanned Areas	0%	No	No	0%		0.6	11.5	19.9	32					0
V	Village	65%	Yes	No	15%	141.8	53.6			195	13.3	3.0			16
<b>Total (acres or runoff units)</b>						<b>2,268</b>	<b>9,339</b>	<b>2,578</b>	<b>10,923</b>	<b>25,108</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>1,147</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>1,549</b>

a. Source: AllBasin\_GPLU.XLS 11/1/06. Areas assigned to multiple land uses are applied to the primary use (i.e. RLM/OS is reassigned RLM).

b. Runoff coefficient source: McCuen, M. 1998 "Hydrologic Analysis and Design", p.377. The PLDA fees are based on incremental additional runoff coefficients above the existing runoff level of open space (20 percent).

c. Under Municipal City code, publicly owned parcels (including city, county and school lands) cannot be charged PLDA fees when developed.

d. Constrained land in parcels is constrained by subdivision and building codes from development. These constrained areas, as well as all open space, remain undeveloped, do not increase drainage requirements or require new facilities, and are not be billed as PLDA fees.

e. Values are developed from similar land use types.

Table 5-3 (continued). Land Development by PLDA

		4. Estimated Existing Development					5. Future Infill (residential, industrial and commercial #4*Infill)				
Land Use Code	Land Use Description	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	City Total	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	City Total
C	Commercial	0	1	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	1
C/O/RMH	Community Commercial/Professional & Related/Medium-High Density	0	0	0	123	123	0	0	0	12	12
CF	Community Facilities (c)	1	3	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0
CF/P	Community Facilities/Private Schools (c)	0	0	0	16	16	0	0	0	0	0
E	Elementary School	23	41	1	121	187	0	0	0	0	0
E/J	Elementary School/Junior High (c)	8	12	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0
G	Governmental Facilities	8	173	139	0	321	0	0	0	0	0
G/O	Government Facilities/Office & Related Commercial (c)	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
H	High School	1	45	0	88	135	0	0	0	0	0
HC	Continuation School	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
J	Junior High School	0	22	0	29	51	0	0	0	0	0
L	Local Shopping Mall (c)	27	8	0	38	73	3	1	0	4	7
N	Neighborhood Commercial	0	0	9	12	20	0	0	1	1	2
O	Office & Related Commercial	5	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	1
O/PI	Office & Related Commercial/Planned Industrial (c)	0	25	49	0	73	0	2	5	0	7
OS	Open Space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	Private School	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
PI	Planned Industrial	0	851	674	89	1,614	0	85	67	9	161
PI/O	Planned Industrial/Office & Related	0	0	28	2	30	0	0	3	0	3
R	Regional Commercial	73	56	19	0	147	7	6	2	0	15
R/O/RMH	Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Medium-High Density (c)	0	0	0	15	15	0	0	0	2	2
RH	High Density Residential	10	122	5	90	227	1	12	0	9	23
RH/C/O	High Density Residential/Community Commercial/Office and Related Comm	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
RH/L/CF	Hi Dens Res/Affordable Housing/Local Shop Ctr/Comm Facil (c)	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	2	2
RH/O	High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
RL	Low Density Residential	3	90	9	310	411	0	9	1	31	41
RLM	Low-Medium Density Residential	617	1,821	208	2,836	5,482	62	182	21	284	548
RM	Medium Density Residential	171	350	290	1,031	1,842	17	35	29	103	184
RM/O	Medium Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	8	0	2	2	12	1	0	0	0	1
RMH	Medium-High Density Residential	89	163	28	444	725	9	16	3	44	73
RMH/O	Medium-High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	7	7	0	0	14	1	1	0	0	1
RMH/T-R	Medium-High Density Residential/Travel/Recreation Commercial	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0
TC	Transportation Corridor	67	151	84	152	454	0	0	0	0	0
T-R	Travel/Recreation Commercial	1	60	169	82	312	0	6	17	8	31
T-R/C	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Community Commercial	0	1	10	13	24	0	0	1	1	2
T-R/L	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Local Shopping Center (c)	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	2	2
T-R/O	Travel/Recreation Commercial/ Office & Related Commercial	0	6	5	0	10	0	1	0	0	1
T-R/O/OS	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Open Space	77	0	0	0	77	8	0	0	0	8
T-R/RH	Travel/Recreation Commercial/High Density (c)	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	1
U	Public Utilities	1	130	28	10	169	0	0	0	0	0
UA	Unplanned Areas	0	1	11	20	32	0	0	0	0	0
V	Village	107	43	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total (acres or runoff units)</b>		<b>1,306</b>	<b>4,191</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>5,595</b>	<b>12,861</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>1,130</b>

BROWN AND CALDWELL

Table 5-4. Land Use and Future Development by PLDA

Land Use Code	Land Use Description	6. Total New Development (#3 & #5, acres)					7. Billable Developments (#1 & #6, acres)					Runoff Coeff (Incr.)	8. Gross New Runoff Loads (#6 x Coeff, Units billable & unbillable)				Grand Total Units
		PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	City Total	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	City Total		PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	
C	Commercial	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.6	2	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.6	2	65%	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.0	1
C/O/RM	Community Commercial/Professional & Related/Medium-High Density	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	12	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	12	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	8
CF	Community Facilities	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	2
CF/P	Community Facilities/Private Schools	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
E	Elementary School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
E/J	Elementary School/Junior High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
G	Governmental Facilities	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
G/O	Government Facilities/Office & Related Commercial	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
H	High School	0.0	33.8	0.0	0.0	34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	10.1	0.0	0.0	10
HC	Continuation School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
J	Junior High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
L	Local Shopping Mall	2.7	18.4	0.0	43.6	65	2.7	18.4	0.0	43.6	65	65%	1.8	12.0	0.0	28.4	42
N	Neighborhood Commercial	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.2	2	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.2	2	65%	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.8	1
O	Office & Related Commercial	0.9	2.0	0.0	7.0	10	0.9	2.0	0.0	7.0	10	65%	0.6	1.3	0.0	4.5	6
O/PI	Office & Related Commercial/Planned Industrial	0.0	2.5	4.9	0.0	7	0.0	2.5	4.9	0.0	7	65%	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.0	5
OS	Open Space	0.5	5.6	0.0	0.0	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
P	Private School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
PI	Planned Industrial	0.0	414.0	80.1	9.1	503	0.0	414.0	80.1	9.1	503	65%	0.0	269.1	52.0	5.9	327
PI/O	Planned Industrial/Office & Related	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.2	3	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.2	3	65%	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.1	2
R	Regional Commercial	9.2	46.1	1.9	0.0	57	9.2	46.1	1.9	0.0	57	65%	6.0	30.0	1.2	0.0	37
R/O/RM	Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Medium-High Density	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	2	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1
RH	High Density Residential	1.2	14.9	0.5	11.6	28	1.2	14.9	0.5	11.6	28	45%	0.5	6.7	0.2	5.2	13
RH/C/O	High Density Residential/Community Commercial/Office and Related Comm	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	5	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	5	50%	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	2
RH/L/CF	Hi Dens Res/Affordable Housing/Local Shop Ctr/Comm Facil	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2	50%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1
RH/O	High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0	50%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
RL	Low Density Residential	1.3	144.0	0.9	52.8	199	1.3	144.0	0.9	52.8	199	15%	0.2	21.6	0.1	7.9	30
RLM	Low-Medium Density Residential	128.1	704.3	40.1	415.6	1,288	128.1	704.3	40.1	415.6	1,288	15%	19.2	105.6	6.0	62.3	193
RM	Medium Density Residential	17.4	40.7	30.0	144.4	232	17.4	40.7	30.0	144.4	232	20%	3.5	8.1	6.0	28.9	46
RM/O	Medium Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	0.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	1	0.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	1	25%	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0
RMH	Medium-High Density Residential	11.0	24.3	2.8	60.5	99	11.0	24.3	2.8	60.5	99	30%	3.3	7.3	0.8	18.1	30
RMH/O	Medium-High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	1.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	3	1.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	3	30%	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	1
RMH/T-R	Medium-High Density Residential/Travel/Recreation Commercial	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	5	30%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	2
TC	Transportation Corridor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
T-R	Travel/Recreation Commercial	0.7	43.3	18.6	9.5	72	0.7	43.3	18.6	9.5	72	65%	0.5	28.1	12.1	6.1	47
T-R/C	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Community Commercial	0.0	0.1	1.0	1.3	2	0.0	0.1	1.0	1.3	2	65%	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.9	2
T-R/L	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Local Shopping Center	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1
T-R/O	Travel/Recreation Commercial/ Office & Related Commercial	0.0	0.6	4.7	0.0	5	0.0	0.6	4.7	0.0	5	65%	0.0	0.4	3.1	0.0	3
T-	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Office & Related	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8	50%	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4
R/O/OS	Commercial/Open Space	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	1	65%	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0
T-R/RH	Travel/Recreation Commercial/High Density	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	45%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
U	Public Utilities	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
UA	Unplanned Areas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
V	Village	13.3	3.0	0.0	0.0	16	13.3	3.0	0.0	0.0	16	65%	8.6	1.9	0.0	0.0	11
<b>Total (acres or runoff units)</b>		<b>196</b>	<b>1,504</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>2,679</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>782</b>	<b>2,631</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>829</b>
		Percent Billable to Total Developments					100%	97%	100%	99%	98%	Gross RM Acres:	243	2,534	440	930	4,146
The planning period for the Drainage Master Plan is limited to the period defined for the scheduled development projects.							Net Billable RM Acres:						243	2,483	440	918	4,084
							Residential RM Acres:						136	760	66	626	1,589
							Res as % of Total Billable:						56%	31%	15%	68%	39%

Table 5-5. Total PLDA-Related Balances, Costs &amp; Payments

Description	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	Net from Each PLDA
New Development Projects	\$1,643,289	\$12,593,270	\$4,251,961	\$1,983,958	\$20,472,477
Less Differential Due on Net Fees with Deposits		(\$1,074,220)			(\$1,074,220)
Less PLDA Fund Balance	(\$164,866)	(\$2,794,399)	(\$3,436,213)	(\$214,271)	(\$6,609,749)
Unfunded Costs within each PLDA	\$1,478,423	\$8,724,650	\$815,748	\$1,769,687	\$12,788,508
Less Project Costs in Public Lands	\$0	\$174,318	(\$0)	\$22,462	\$196,779
Total Costs to be Recovered from Future PLDA Fees	<b>\$1,478,423</b>	<b>\$8,550,333</b>	<b>\$815,748</b>	<b>\$1,747,225</b>	<b>\$12,591,729</b>
Proceeds from Future PLDA Fees	\$1,478,423	\$8,550,333	\$815,748	\$1,747,225	\$12,591,729

Table 5-6. Project Costs Allocated to Land Uses by PLDA

Land Use Code	Land Use Description	9. Allocated Project Costs (spread based on #8)					10. Project Costs Recovered from Billable Parcels (#1 Billable and #9, a)				
		PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	Grand Total	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	Total
C	Commercial	\$0	\$2,574	\$0	\$9,792	\$12,366	\$0	\$2,574	\$0	\$9,792	\$12,366
C/O/RMH	Community Commercial/Professional & Related/Medium-High Density	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,960	\$75,960	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,960	\$75,960
CF	Community Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,462	\$22,462	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CF/P	Community Facilities/Private Schools	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
E	Elementary School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
E/J	Elementary School/Junior High	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
G	Governmental Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
G/O	Government Facilities/Office & Related Commercial	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
H	High School	\$0	\$174,318	\$0	\$0	\$174,318	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
HC	Continuation School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
J	Junior High School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
L	Local Shopping Mall	\$53,699	\$205,974	\$0	\$269,738	\$529,412	\$53,699	\$205,974	\$0	\$269,738	\$529,412
N	Neighborhood Commercial	\$0	\$0	\$5,223	\$7,168	\$12,391	\$0	\$0	\$5,223	\$7,168	\$12,391
O	Office & Related Commercial	\$18,160	\$22,663	\$0	\$43,117	\$83,939	\$18,160	\$22,663	\$0	\$43,117	\$83,939
O/PI	Office & Related Commercial/Planned Industrial	\$0	\$27,584	\$29,326	\$0	\$56,910	\$0	\$27,584	\$29,326	\$0	\$56,910
OS	Open Space	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
P	Private School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PI	Planned Industrial	\$0	\$4,632,830	\$482,750	\$56,222	\$5,171,802	\$0	\$4,632,830	\$482,750	\$56,222	\$5,171,802
PI/O	Planned Industrial/Office & Related	\$0	\$0	\$16,806	\$1,332	\$18,138	\$0	\$0	\$16,806	\$1,332	\$18,138
R	Regional Commercial	\$181,697	\$515,870	\$11,252	\$0	\$708,820	\$181,697	\$515,870	\$11,252	\$0	\$708,820
R/O/RMH	Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Medium-High Density	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,522	\$9,522	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,522	\$9,522
RH	High Density Residential	\$16,157	\$115,481	\$1,914	\$49,622	\$183,174	\$16,157	\$115,481	\$1,914	\$49,622	\$183,174
RH/C/O	High Density Residential/Community Commercial/Office and Related Comm	\$0	\$38,813	\$0	\$0	\$38,813	\$0	\$38,813	\$0	\$0	\$38,813
RH/L/CF	Hi Dens Res/Affordable Housing/Local Shop Ctr/Comm Facil	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,397	\$10,397	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,397	\$10,397
RH/O	High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380	\$380	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380	\$380
RL	Low Density Residential	\$6,124	\$371,938	\$1,201	\$75,294	\$454,558	\$6,124	\$371,938	\$1,201	\$75,294	\$454,558
RLM	Low-Medium Density Residential	\$585,348	\$1,818,755	\$55,826	\$593,102	\$3,053,031	\$585,348	\$1,818,755	\$55,826	\$593,102	\$3,053,031
RM	Medium Density Residential	\$106,242	\$140,060	\$55,596	\$274,790	\$576,688	\$106,242	\$140,060	\$55,596	\$274,790	\$576,688
RM/O	Medium Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	\$5,948	\$0	\$479	\$390	\$6,816	\$5,948	\$0	\$479	\$390	\$6,816
RMH	Medium-High Density Residential	\$100,488	\$125,270	\$7,860	\$172,550	\$406,167	\$100,488	\$125,270	\$7,860	\$172,550	\$406,167
RMH/O	Medium-High Density Residential/ Office & Related Commercial	\$10,073	\$7,413	\$0	\$0	\$17,486	\$10,073	\$7,413	\$0	\$0	\$17,486
RMH/T-R	Medium-High Density Residential/Travel/Recreation Commercial	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,183	\$15,183	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,183	\$15,183
TC	Transportation Corridor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
T-R	Travel/Recreation Commercial	\$14,805	\$484,366	\$112,248	\$58,457	\$669,877	\$14,805	\$484,366	\$112,248	\$58,457	\$669,877
T-R/C	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Community Commercial	\$0	\$1,003	\$6,047	\$8,295	\$15,345	\$0	\$1,003	\$6,047	\$8,295	\$15,345
T-R/L	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Local Shopping Center	\$0	\$0	\$12	\$13,402	\$13,414	\$0	\$0	\$12	\$13,402	\$13,414
T-R/O	Travel/Recreation Commercial/ Office & Related Commercial	\$58	\$6,502	\$28,531	\$0	\$35,091	\$58	\$6,502	\$28,531	\$0	\$35,091
T-R/O/OS	Travel/Recreation Commercial/Office & Related Commercial/Open Space	\$117,220	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$117,220	\$117,220	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$117,220
T-R/RH	Travel/Recreation Commercial/High Density	\$0	\$0	\$677	\$2,513	\$3,190	\$0	\$0	\$677	\$2,513	\$3,190
U	Public Utilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
UA	Unplanned Areas	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
V	Village	\$262,403	\$33,237	\$0	\$0	\$295,639	\$262,403	\$33,237	\$0	\$0	\$295,639
<b>Total (acres or runoff units)</b>		<b>\$1,478,423</b>	<b>\$8,724,650</b>	<b>\$815,748</b>	<b>\$1,769,687</b>	<b>\$12,788,508</b>	<b>\$1,478,423</b>	<b>\$8,550,333</b>	<b>\$815,748</b>	<b>\$1,747,225</b>	<b>\$12,591,729</b>
		Percent Billable to Project Costs					100%	98%		99%	98%

Values provided herein follow from Table 5-7.

a. Under Municipal City code, publicly owned parcels (including city, county and school lands) cannot be charged PLDA fees when developed.

BROWN AND CALDWELL

Table 5-7. PLDA Fee Calculations

Description	Updated PLDA Fees				
	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	Total
<b>Billable Acres (by runoff level)</b>					
Low	129	848	41	468	1,487
Medium	39	86	33	224	383
High	27	530	115	90	762
Total	195	1,464	189	782	2,631
Total Developable Area	196	1,504	189	790	2,679
Less Unbillable Areas (a)	0	39	0	8	48
Total Billable Acres	195	1,464	189	782	2,631
Total Billable Equivalent RM Acres	243	2,483	440	918	4,084
<b>Billable Project Costs (2006 Costs, by runoff level)</b>					
Low	\$591,473	\$2,190,693	\$57,027	\$668,396	\$3,507,589
Medium	\$356,128	\$427,037	\$65,848	\$523,311	\$1,372,325
High	\$530,822	\$5,932,603	\$692,873	\$555,518	\$7,711,815
Total	\$1,478,423	\$8,550,333	\$815,748	\$1,747,225	\$12,591,729
Un-recovered Project Costs	\$0	\$174,318	\$0	\$22,462	\$196,779
<b>Updated PLDA Fees (\$/Acre, by runoff level with current fee as minimum)</b>					<b>Average</b>
Low	\$4,570	\$2,582	\$1,391	\$1,427	\$2,472
Medium	\$9,088	\$4,978	\$1,968	\$2,334	\$4,274
High	\$19,804	\$11,191	\$6,029	\$6,184	\$10,125

RM: Residential Medium Density development

a. Under California Government Code, development extractions (PLDA fees) must be based on the nexus between the drainage loads from a land use type and the cost of facilities collecting and channeling those loads. Under Municipal City code, publicly owned parcels (including city, county and district lands) cannot be charged PLDA fees. As such, the PLDA fees cannot be based on recovering project costs allocated to these land use types.

Table 5-8. PLDA Fee Comparison Summary

Description	Affected Areas	Affected Dwellings	PLDA Fees				Average
	(acres)	(DUs)	PLDA A	PLDA B	PLDA C	PLDA D	
Current PLDA Fees (\$/Acre, effective 9/1/2006, by runoff level)							
Low			\$2,208	\$4,748	\$3,549	\$49	\$3,014
High			\$3,614	\$7,767	\$5,809	\$79	\$6,419
Updated PLDA Fees (\$/Acre by runoff level, with minimums)							
Low			\$4,570	\$2,582	\$1,391	\$1,427	\$2,472
Medium			\$9,088	\$4,978	\$1,968	\$2,334	\$4,274
High			\$19,804	\$11,191	\$6,029	\$6,184	\$10,125
Changes in PLDA Fees							
Low	1,522	5,524	\$2,362	(\$2,166)	(\$2,158)	\$1,378	(\$542)
High	133	1,796	\$16,190	\$3,424	\$220	\$6,105	\$3,706
PLDA Fees per Residential Household (\$ per dwelling unit, a)							
RLM low-medium density housing with 3.2 DUs/acre (Low Runoff)	1,288	4,122	\$1,428	\$807	\$435	\$446	\$772
RM medium density housing (Runoff Levels: old Low -- proposed Medium)	234	1,402	\$1,515	\$830	\$328	\$389	\$712
RMH medium-high density housing with 11.5 DUs/acre (Runoff old High -- proposed Medium)	99	1,133	\$1,515	\$830	\$328	\$389	\$712
RH High density housing with 19 DUs/ acre (Runoffs: old High -- proposed Medium)	35	663	\$1,042	\$589	\$317	\$325	\$533

a. The housing densities are based on the growth control point densities of the 2000 General Plan Table 37.



## APPENDICES

---

### Appendix A

2006 Planned Land Development Characteristics by PLDA

### Appendix B

Runoff Coefficients for Different Land Use Types

### Appendix C

Fee Categories and Cost Allocations